FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL	Application Number 09/986346 RECEIVE	
	Filing Date	November 8, 2001 CENTRAL FAX GET
	First Named Inventor	Bowers, John L. OCT 2 1 200
FORM	Art Unit	3753
	Examiner Name	John A. Rivell
Fax: 571-273-8300	Attorney Docket Number	54135US011
Total Number of Pages in This	Submission: 7	
Date: October 21, 2005	Attorney for Applicant: Karl G. Hanson	
	CLOSURES (check all th	
☐ Fee Transmittal Form ☐ Issue Fee Transmittal ☐ Amendment Transmittal	Petition	Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
Amendment/Reply After Final Affidavits/Declaration(s)	Petition to Convert a Provis Application	ional Appeal Communication to Technology Center (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)
☐ Extension of Time Request	☐ Power of Attorney, Revocat	ion Proprietary Information
Express Abandonment Request	Change of Correspondence Address	☐ Status Letter
Information Disclosure Statement	☐ Terminal Discleimer	Other Enclosures:  Communication and copy of Final
Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR § 1.52 or 1.53 Response to Missing Parts under 35 USC 371 in US Designated/ Elected Office (DO/EO/US)	☐ Request for Refund	Judgment
	Request for Continued Examination (RCE) Transm	ittal
☐ Drawings	After Allowance Communication to Technol Center	logy
	REMARKS:	

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION MAY CONTAIN CONFIDENTIAL OR LEGALLY PRIVILEGED INFORMATION INTENDED ONLY FOR THE PERSON OR ENTITY NAMED BELOW.

If you are not the intended recipient, please do not read, use, disclose, distribute or copy this transmission. If this transmission was received in error, please immediately notify me by telephonedirectly at 651-736-7776 or 651-733-1500, and we will arrange for its return at no cost to you.

10/21/05 09:44 问:02/07 No:430

RECEIVED **CENTRAL FAX CENTER** 

Patent

OCT 2 1 2005

Case No.: 54135US011

Customer Number

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

First Named Inventor:

BOWERS, JOHN L.

Application No.:

09/986346

Group Art Unit:

3753

Filed:

November 8, 2001

Examiner:

John A. Rivell

Title:

UNI-DIRECTIONAL FLUID VALVE

## COMMUNICATION

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION [37 CFR § 1.8(a)]

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being:

- deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.
- Itransmitted by facsimile on the date shown below to the United States Patent and Trademark Office at 571-273-8300.

October 21, 2005

Date

Dear Sir:

In an Information Disclosure Statement submitted April 7, 2005, applicants brought two lawsuits to the attention of the United States Patent and Trademark Office. At the time of that submission, both lawsuits against the defendants, Moldex-Metric Inc. and the Louis M. Gerson Company, were pending. Presently, the Moldex-Metric lawsuit is still pending in the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota, but the Gerson lawsuit has reached conclusion. Attached is a copy of a Final Judgment that has been issued in the Gerson lawsuit.

Respectfully submitted,

October 21, 2005

Date

Karl G. Hanson, Reg. No.: 32,900

Telephone No.: 651-736-7776

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel 3M Innovative Properties Company Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833

Case 0:05-cv-00026-MJD-SRN Document 43 Filed 08/22/2005 Page 1 of 5

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
OCT 2 1 2005

3M COMPANY and	
3M INNOVATIVE PROPERTIES COMPANY,	) } }
Plaintiffs,	)
vs.	) Civil File No.: 05-CV-26 (MJD/JGL)
LOUIS M. GERSON CO., INC.	)
Defendant	) )

### FINAL JUDGMENT

The Court having considered the pleadings, facts and applicable law, Final Judgment is hereby entered as follows:

#### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

- 1. Plaintiff 3M Company ("3M") is a Delaware corporation having its principal place of business at 3M Center, St. Paul, Minnesota 55133-3427. 3M Company is in the business of manufacturing and selling a wide variety of consumer, commercial and industrial products, including filtering face masks.
- Plaintiff 3M Innovative Properties Company ("3M IPC") is a Delaware corporation having its principal place of business at 3M Center, St. Paul, Minnesota 55133-3427.
   3M IPC is a wholly owned subsidiary of 3M and is in the business, *inter alia*, of obtaining, managing and licensing intellectual property.

Case 0:05-cy-00026-MJD-SRN Document 43 Filed 08/22/2005 Page 2 of 5

- 3. Defendant Louis M. Gerson Co. ("Gerson") is a Delaware corporation having its principal place of business at 15 Sproat Street, Middleboro, MA 02346. Gerson is in the business of manufacturing and selling industrial products, including filtering face masks.
- 4. Plaintiff 3M Innovative Properties Company ("3M IPC") owns U.S. Patent No. RE 37,974 E ("the '974 patent"); U.S. Patent No. 6,843,248 B2 ("the '248 patent); and U.S. Patent No. 6,854,463 B2 ("the '463 patent"). Each of these patents is directed to filtering face masks that include one-way exhalation valves. The patented masks allow a person to rapidly exhale warm, moist air through the valve without permitting unfiltered air to enter the mask.
- 5. Plaintiff 3M Company is the exclusive licensee of the '974 patent, the '248 patent, and the '463 patent.
- 6. Defendant Louis M. Gerson Co., Inc. ("Gerson") has sold and continues to sell filtering face pieces that have exhalation valves ("Gerson's valved masks"), representative examples of which are identified in 3M's Second Amended Complaint.
- 7. Plaintiffs brought this action against Defendant contending that Gerson's valved masks infringe the '974 patent, the '248 patent, and the '463 patent. The "products-in-suit" include the Gerson valved masks that are listed in the parties' Settlement Agreement dated August 9, 2005 ("the Settlement Agreement") and that are made, used, sold, imported, exported, and/or offered for sale in the United States.
- 8. Any Finding of Fact which is deemed to be a Conclusion of Law is hereby adopted as such.

Case 0:05-cv-00026-MJD-SRN Document 43 Filed 08/22/2005 Page 3 of 5

### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 9. This is an action for patent infringement arising under the patent laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 271 et seq. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).
- 10. This Court has personal jurisdiction over the parties, and venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b).
- 11. All claims of the '974 patent, the '248 patent, and the '463 patent that have been issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office as of the date of this Consent Judgment are valid and enforceable based on the Defendant's past, present, and future products.
  - 12. The products-in-suit infringe the '974 patent, the '248 patent, and the '463 patent.
- 13. The issues of patent infringement in this case are hereby finally concluded and disposed of, and this Judgment bars Defendant from contending in this action or any other proceeding that the products in suit and other products that are only colorably different do not infringe the '974 patent, the '248 patent, and the '463 patent.
- 14. This Judgment shall finally conclude and dispose of this litigation, and as to all parties, this Judgment shall be entitled to issue preclusion, claim preclusion, res judicata, and collateral estoppel effect in future litigation or United States Patent and Trademark Office proceedings related to the '974 patent, the '248 patent, and the '463 patent. The Court and the parties explicitly intend such issue preclusion, claim preclusion, res judicata, and collateral estoppel effects to extend to the issues of claim construction, validity, and enforceability regarding any claim of the '974 patent, the '248 patent, or the '463 patent whether raised in a court proceeding, U.S.P.T.O. proceeding, re-examination, reissue or other dispute even with respect to materially different products.

Case 0:05-cv-00026-MJD-SRN Document 43 Filed 08/22/2005 Page 4 of 5

15. Any Conclusion of Law that is deemed to be a Finding of Fact is hereby adopted as such.

## **ORDER**

- A. Damages for past infringement and for Defendant's future use of the inventions in the '974 patent, the '248 patent, and the '463 patent shall be in accordance with the Settlement Agreement. The Settlement Agreement shall be binding on the parties notwithstanding that the '974 patent, the '248 patent, or the '463 patent may be held invalid or unenforceable in any other proceedings, or may be held to be not infringed by products in any other proceedings.
- B. Defendant, including its officers, directors, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, and all persons controlling or in active concert or participation with, through, or under them are hereby enjoined from infringing any claim of the '974 patent, the '248 patent, or the '463 patent and from causing, inducing, or contributing to the infringement of the '974 patent, the '248 patent, or the '463 patent by any other.
- C. This Court retains exclusive jurisdiction of this action for the purpose of insuring compliance with this Judgment and for all issues associated with the Judgment and the Settlement Agreement.
- D. No appeal shall be taken from this Judgment by any party to this action, the right to appeal having been expressly waived by all parties.
- E. . This Final Judgment shall finally conclude and dispose of all claims and counterclaims of all parties with prejudice.

F. This Final Judgment shall be entered without further notice.

The Clerk is directed to enter this Final Judgment.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 19, 2005

s/ Michael J. Davis
The Honorable Michael J. Davis
United States District Judge